

1 **REMARKS**

2 Claims 1, 12, 19, 25, 30 and 32 are amended. Claims 1-39 remain
3 in the application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant
4 respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to
5 issuance.

6
7 **Amendment to Specification**

8 The specification has been amended to insert the relevant
9 application numbers on pages 8 and 9.

10
11 **The § 102 Rejections**

12 Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being
13 anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,398 to Parthasarathy et al.
14 (hereinafter "Parthasarathy").

15 Before discussing the substance of the Office's rejections, the
16 following discussion of Applicant's disclosure is provided in an attempt to
17 assist the Office in appreciating the patentable distinctions between
18 Applicant's claimed subject matter and the cited reference.

19
20 **Applicant's Disclosure**

21 Applicant's disclosure pertains to methods and systems for
22 processing multi-media editing projects. In some instances, the
23 environment in which multi-media editing projects are created is a file
24 sharing environment in which the multi-media files that can be used for
25 particular projects are shared among multiple users. Typically, in these

1 environments, the files are maintained in a large network-accessible
2 database or storage facility. When a user wishes to use a particular multi-
3 media file in an editing project, they will typically retrieve the file from the
4 network and incorporate the file into their project. When many users are
5 part of this sharing environment, significant slowdowns can be
6 experienced when the users attempt to run their projects off of the network.

7 As an aside, multi-media files are typically very large files, e.g. 100
8 Megabytes to 8 Gigabytes. Additionally, multi-media files themselves are
9 not generally changed by the users. Rather, the users use the files in their
10 multi-media editing projects which themselves can change from user to
11 user. Thus, in this environment, the types of files that are employed are
12 typically large, unchanging files. Accordingly, it is easy to understand and
13 appreciate, from the size of these files, the network slowdowns that can be
14 caused when multiple users attempt to run their projects off of the network.

15 Fig. 40 shows but one exemplary system 4000 in accordance with
16 the inventive embodiments. System 4000 includes a network 4002 which
17 can be any suitable network, e.g. LAN, WAN and the like. A multi-media
18 file storage facility 4004 is provided and is accessible via the network
19 4002. A number of different user computers are provided, with exemplary
20 computers 4006, 4008, and 4010 being shown. Each user computer has an
21 associated local storage mechanism, e.g. a hard drive.

22 Each of the user computers typically executes a multi-media editing
23 application which allows a user to build a multi-media editing project as
24 described above. The inventive techniques permit a user to retrieve one or
25 more multi-media files from a network accessible storage location and

1 maintain the files locally, e.g. in directories on their hard drive. When they
2 then request particular multi-media files for use, the editing application
3 can first check one or more local directories for the requested files, rather
4 than checking the network. If the requested files are not found locally,
5 then the editing application can check the network-accessible file locations
6 for the requested file. By maintaining the multi-media files locally,
7 network slowdown issues can be mitigated.

8 Fig. 41 is a flow diagram that describes steps in a method in
9 accordance with the described embodiment.

10 Step 4100 generates a request for a network-maintained multi-
11 media file. This request is ordinarily generated by a multi-media editing
12 application executing on a user computer, such as any one of computers
13 4006-4010 (Fig. 40). Step 4102 intercepts the request locally. Step 4104
14 then ascertains whether the file or files referenced in the request exist.
15 Step 4106 determines one or more local directories where multi-media
16 files are, or have been maintained. *Specifically, as a user retrieves and*
17 *uses multi-media files, they can store them locally. When they store*
18 *them locally, they typically have certain designated directories that*
19 *contain the files, e.g. "C:/myfiles/multimedia_files". Alternately, they*
20 *might store the files anywhere on their hard drive. A user can then*
21 *designate appropriate directories as directories that contain multi-media*
22 *files.* One example of when a user can do this is given below. *Thus,*
23 *when a request is intercepted, as in step 4102, the software can quickly*
24 *ascertain the directories of interest (e.g. the directories that have been*
25 *designated by a user as containing multi-media files) that are likely to*

1 *contain the multi-media files. Step 4108 then checks the determined*
2 *local directories for the requested multi-media file. This step is*
3 *advantageous in that it can avoid checking all of the directories of a hard*
4 *drive which can be time consuming. If the file is found locally (step*
5 *4110), then the file is retrieved from its local location and used (step 4112).*
6 *If, on the other hand, the file is not found locally, step 4114 asks the user*
7 *to point to a local directory where the multi-media file might be stored.*
8 *Step 4116 then checks the user-designated directory and if the multi-*
9 *media file is found, step 4112 retrieves and uses the file. If, on the other*
10 *hand, step 4116 does not find the file in the local directory designated by*
11 *the user, step 4118 checks appropriate network directories for the*
12 *requested multi-media file. This step can be implemented by sending on*
13 *the request that was intercepted at step 4102. It will be appreciated and*
14 *understood that once a user designates a new local directory (i.e.*
15 *responsive to step 4114) that contains one multi-media file, the software*
16 *will remember this directory and will automatically check it when multi-*
17 *media files are requested in the future.*

18 19 The Claims

20 **Claim 1** has been amended and recites a method of processing a
21 multi-media editing project comprising [added language appears in bold
22 italics]:

- 23 • generating a request for one or more multi-media files for
24 use in a multi-media editing project, the request being
25 generated by a user computer that comprises part of a
network where multi-media files are maintained in a network
-accessible location;

- intercepting the request;
- ascertaining whether a requested multi-media file is located on the user computer *by checking one or more user-designated directories for the multi-media file*;
- retrieving the multi-media file if the file is located on the user computer; and
- seeking the requested file from the network-accessible location if the multi-media file is not located on the user computer.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully disagrees particularly in view of the amendment that has been made. Specifically, the claim has been amended to recite that the act of “ascertaining” is performed by checking *one or more user-designated directories* for the multi-media file.

In making out a rejection for another claim, the Office cited to Parthasarathy’s column 7, line 65 through column 8, line 12 for the proposition that Parthasarathy disclosed user-designated local directories. This excerpt is set forth just below for the convenience of the Office.

The text string generally is in the form of an MS-DOS command, which specifies a path and file name of the associated application program's executable file, a flag for specifying the desired operation, and the document's path and file name. The command interpreter responds by parsing the text string, loading the application program specified in the text string, and passing the flag and the document's path and file name as command line arguments into the application program. The application program then "opens" (i.e., loads) the document and performs the operation specified by the flag.

1 Applicant respectfully submits that this excerpt does not mention
2 user-designated local directories. Accordingly, this claim is not
3 anticipated by Parthasarathy.

4 **Claims 2-11** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending
5 from an allowable base claim.

6 **Claim 12** has been amended and recites a method of processing a
7 multi-media editing project comprising [added language appears in bold
8 italics]:

- 9
- 10 • maintaining information on a local computer that comprises
11 part of a network having multiple computers, said
12 information being associated with multi-media files that are
13 maintained in a network-accessible location and that can be
14 temporarily stored on the local computer's hard drive; and
- 15 • responsive to a request to retrieve a multi-media file from the
16 network-accessible location, using the information to attempt
17 to locate the requested file on the local computer's hard drive
18 *in one or more user-designated directories* before
19 attempting to retrieve the file in the network-accessible
20 location.

17 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its
18 subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully
19 disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this
20 claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

21 **Claims 13-18** depend from claim 12 and are allowable as
22 depending from an allowable base claim.

23 **Claim 19** has been amended and recites one or more computer-
24 readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which,
25

1 when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language
2 appears in bold italics]:

- 3 • maintain a list on a local computer that comprises part of a
4 network having multiple computers, said list being used to
5 determine which local *user-designated* directories have been
6 used in the past, or are currently being used to stored multi-
7 media files that are maintained in a network-accessible
8 location; and
- 9 • responsive to a request to retrieve a multi-media file from the
10 network-accessible location, use the list to first attempt to
11 locate the requested file on the local computer's hard drive.

12 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its
13 subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully
14 disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this
15 claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

16 **Claims 20-24** depend from claim 19 and are allowable as
17 depending from an allowable base claim.

18 **Claim 25** has been amended and recites a method of processing a
19 multi-media editing project comprising [added language appears in bold
20 italics]:

- 21 • receiving one or more multi-media files from a network-
22 accessible location;
- 23 • locally storing the one or more multi-media files in a local
24 *user-designated* directory on a user computer for use in a
25 multi-media editing project;
- updating a list of local *user-designated* directories that
contain or have contained multi-media files in the past in the
event that the one or more multi-media files are stored in a
local *user-designated* directory that is not contained in the
list;

- responsive to receiving a request for a multi-media file that is maintained in the network-accessible location;
- first checking in all of the local *user-designated* directories on the list of local *user-designated* directories for the requested file; and
- second checking the network-accessible location for the requested file in the event the requested file is not found locally.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

Claims 26-29 depend from claim 25 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 30 has been amended and recites) one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language appears in bold italics]:

- maintain a list of local *user-designated* directories that are or have been used to store multi-media files on a local user computer, the multi-media files being accessible from a network storage location;
- generate a request for a multi-media file that is accessible from a network storage location, the request being intended for use in retrieving a multi-media file from the network accessible storage location;
- intercept the request;
- ascertain a requested file from the request;
- first, determine whether the requested file is locally available by checking all of the local *user-designated* directories maintained on the list and retrieve the requested file from a

1 local *user-designated* directory if the file is locally
maintained;

- 2 • second, seek the requested file from the network storage
location if the file is not locally maintained;
- 3 • store the requested file in a local *user-designated* directory if
4 the requested file is retrieved from the network storage
location; and
- 5 • update the list to reflect the local *user-designated* directory if
6 the local *user-designated* directory in which the requested
file is stored is not on the list.

7
8 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its
9 subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully
10 disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this
11 claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

12 **Claim 31** depends from claim 30 and is allowable as depending
13 from an allowable base claim.

14 **Claim 32** has been amended and recites a multi-media editing
15 system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 16 • a multi-media file locator object configured to intercept
17 network-bound requests for multi-media files and determine
18 whether requested files are locally maintained on a user
computer *in one or more user-designated directories*; and
- 19 • a list associated with the file locator object and referencing
20 local *user-designated* file directories on the user computer
21 where multi-media files are stored, the list being used by the
file locator object to determine whether requested files are
locally maintained on the user computer.

22
23 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its
24 subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. Applicant respectfully
25

1 disagrees in view of the amendment that has been made. Accordingly, this
2 claim is not anticipated by Parthasarathy.

3 **Claims 33-39** depend from claim 32 and are allowable as
4 depending from an allowable base claim.

5
6 **Conclusion**

7 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly,
8 Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the
9 Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a
10 Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for
11 the purpose of scheduling an interview.

12
13 Respectfully submitted,

14
15 Dated: 7/2/04

16 By: 

17 Lance R. Sadler
18 Reg. No. 38,605
19 (509) 324-9256
20
21
22
23
24
25